



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,214	09/18/2000	ATM Shafiquel Khalid	MSI-571US	4287

22801 .7590 05/23/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

CHAVIS, JOHN Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2124

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/665,214

Applicant(s)

KHALID ET AL.

Examiner

John Q. Chavis

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-9, 11-13, 15-16, 18-19, 21, 24-26, 28-35, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hester et al. (6,105,101).

Claims

1. A method for controlling access to storage loci in a common configuration data structure, the method comprising:

receiving an attempt to access a first storage locus in the common configuration data structure from a program module;

determining whether to direct such attempt to at least a second locus in the common configuration data

Hester et al.

See the title, abstract, col. 1 lines 21-30, col. 1 line 59-col 2 line 10.

See col. 2 lines 12-33.

See col. 2 lines 48-65 and col. 3 lines 1-4, which indicates that calls are made as required.

Art Unit: 2124

structure with the program module
unaware that it is accessing the
second locus.

2. ...directing such attempt to at least the second locus... See col. 3 lines 5-27.

5. ...the program module is an application. See col. 55 lines 12-30.

6. ...the first storage locus is reserved...for a first version...
the second storage locus is reserved...for a second version... This feature is inherent in both Hester and Richman's systems.

8. A computer readable medium... See the computer system of Hester's claim 11.

The features of claims 9, 12, 19, 31, 33 are taught via claim 1.

As per claims 11, 18, 28, see the rejection of claim 8.

In reference to claim 13, see the rejection of claim 2.

Claims 15-16, 34-35 are taught via claim 5-6.

The features of claims 38-39 are taught via claim 6.

The features of claims 21 is inherent in claim 1 to enable backward compatibility; since, the intercepting and redirecting features inherently requires searching, and finding to acquire appropriate links and copying to enable calls to systems in different modes. The features of claim 24 are inherent in claim 21; since, a triggering event is inherent to enable interrupt calls.

As per claim 25, see col. 6 lines 1-34.

The features of claim 26 are taught via claim 6.

In reference to claims 29-30, 32, 37, see the rejection of claim 21 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-4, 7, 10, 14, 17, 20, 22-23, 27, 36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hester et al. as applied to claims 1-6 above, and further in view of Richman et al. (5,655,148).

Claims

3. ...determining whether to direct such attempt to at least a third locus in the common configuration data structure with the program module...

Hester/Richman

Hester does not specifically indicate that a determination is made to direct a call to a third locus; however, he determines whether to direct a call to a second locus (col. 3 lines 1-4) to enable a 16 bit application to be compatible with a 32 bit system (see again the abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hester's system to further enable backward compatibility with an 8 bit application to further improve backward compatibility as required (col. 1 lines 25-30.) Richman further, as indicated in claim 4 below, teach the use of a registry to indicate compatible links. This feature further indicates that multiple locus exists and therefore, it would have been further obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to enable automatic configuration with multiple systems to enhance usability of the system, see the title.

4. ...examining a loci-redirection table, wherein the determining is based, at least in part, upon information in the table.

Hester does not specifically indicate that his system utilizes a table; however, Richman provides for the feature of utilizing a registry (table) to enable communication between various environments by redirecting calls (col. 45 line 66-col. 46 line 8, col. 53 lines 7-18 and col. 54 lines 35-42).

7. ...the common configuration data structure is a registry.

See the cited portions of claim 4.

In reference to claims 10, 20, 22, see the rejection of claim 3 above.

The features of claims 14 and 23 are taught via claim 4.

Claims 17, 27, 36 are taught via claim 7.

As per claim 40, see the rejection of claim 4.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Q. Chavis whose telephone number is 703-305-9665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:00 pm Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 703-305-9662. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/665,214

Page 6

Art Unit: 2124

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-3900.



Jqc

May 19, 2003



JOHN CHAVIS
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2124